

REMARKS

This communication responds to the Office Action dated August 21, 2009.

Claims 16, 19, and 31 are amended, claim 18 is canceled, and no claims are added by this response. Claims 16-17, 19-26, and 31-38 are now pending in this application.

§ 103 Rejection of the Claims

1. Claims 16, 20-21, 23-25, and 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cseri et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0046317; hereinafter “Cseri”), in view of Petersen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0144556; hereinafter “Petersen”). Independent claims 16 and 31 include an amendment to clarify certain aspects of the present subject matter. An example of support for the amendments can be found on page 3, line 15 through page 4, line 2.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because obviousness does not presently exist with respect to these claims. For example, Applicant cannot find in Cseri and Petersen and/or the reasoning of the Office Action, among other things,

[converting] the compressed binary stream into compressed ASCII text encoded from the compressed binary stream, and [formatting] the compressed ASCII text so as to form a compressed valid XML document,

as similarly recited in independent claims 16 and 31.

Instead of the formatted compressed ASCII text, the cited portions of Cseri state that an arbitrary well-formed XML document is converted to a binary formatted XML document by tokenizing (§0063, lines 8-12, and lines 17-23, and §0092 lines). When the binary formatted document is then received by a device, parsing is used to convert the document back into text (*see* Cseri, §0063, 0067). The parsed document is then eventually forwarded to an application or a standard text parser. Thus, parsing in Cseri is used to reconvert the binary formatted document back to the original document and to create a compressed document. Petersen is apparently used for its reference to tokenizing XML documents. Thus, because Cseri relates to tokenizing to create a binary document, modifying Cseri with the tokenizing of Petersen would still result in a binary formatted document, and not to what is claimed by the Applicant.

The Office Action states that “the compressed binary document is also converted to parsed XML data and XML document” in Cseri. Thus, it appears that the Office Action is attempting to compare the parsing of a binary document in Cseri to the recited *converting a compressed binary stream to a compressed ASCII text encoded from the compressed binary stream*. However, the parsing in Cseri is related to the process of reconverting the binary document back to the original text (Cseri, ¶¶0063, 0067) and not related to creating a compressed document.

Additionally, the Office Action concedes that Cseri, Petersen and Girardot do not disclose a compression module that includes a binary to ASCII encoding algorithm, but states that this is taught in Tycksen. The cited portion of Tycksen refers to a binary-based content to a certificate being converted to the ASCII-code set (*see* Tycksen, col. 9, lines 7-15). Applicant respectfully submits that, upon reading these documents, one of ordinary skill in the art would not reasonably be led to combine Cseri, Petersen and Girardot with Tycksen.

Cseri states that binary formatting is desired because it minimizes parsing time and the generation of overhead incident to formatting and parsing of data (*see*, Cseri ¶¶0006). Thus, Cseri teaches away from converting from the binary format to text. Also, the Office Action states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Tycksen with Cseri in order to convert the XML binary data to ASCII text in order to provide the XML document to a user. However, if one of ordinary skill in the art wanted an XML document presentable to a user, those skilled would presumably leave the XML file as it was in its original XML form and not convert the file to binary and then to ASCII. Further, Cseri refers to reconvert the binary formatted to an XML format by parsing before forwarding to an appropriate application (*see*, Cseri ¶¶0067). Thus, a presentable XML document is already disclosed in Cseri, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not reasonably be led to modify Cseri using Tycksen to provide an XML document already available by Cseri.

Therefore, these documents do not provide using a transformation to and from ASCII in the framework of XML compression.

Furthermore, in regard to claim 16, Applicant cannot find in Cseri and Petersen “[formatting] the compressed ASCII text so as to form a compressed valid XML document, including replacing any invalid XML characters with standard XML replacement text.”

Further still, claim 31 recites “[converting] the compressed binary stream into compressed ASCII text ... and [formatting] the compressed ASCII text so as to form a compressed valid XML document *for transfer over the network.*”

The cited portions of Cseri state that a binary formatted XML document is received by a device before it is parsed back into text (see Cseri, ¶0063, 0067). Petersen appears to be used for its reference to tokenizing and parsing an XML document (*see* Petersen ¶0083). Thus, Cseri with Petersen would still relate to transfer of a *binary formatted* document, and not relate to transfer of a compressed binary stream converted to compressed ASCII text formatted as a compressed valid XML document.

Therefore, Cseri with Petersen and/or the reasoning of the Office Action do not teach or suggest each and every element of these claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 16, 20-21, 23-25, and 31-35 are respectfully requested.

2. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cseri and Petersen as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Girardot et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0023628; hereinafter “Girardot”). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 17 depends on base claim 16. As set forth above, Applicant believes base claim 16 to be allowable at least for the reason that Cseri with Petersen fails to provide some of the elements of the base claim. Girardot fails to provide the missing elements, such as:

[converting] the compressed binary stream into compressed ASCII text encoded from the compressed binary stream, and [formatting] the compressed ASCII text so as to form a compressed valid XML document,

as incorporated into claim 17 from base claim 16. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 17 is respectfully requested.

3. Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cseri, Petersen and Girardot as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Tycksen, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,189,097; hereinafter “Tycksen”). Claim 18 has been canceled. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to claim 19.

Claim 19 depends on base claim 16. As set forth above, Applicant believes base claim 16 to be allowable at least for the reason that Cseri, Petersen and Girardot fail to provide some of the elements of the base claim. Tycksen fails to provide the missing elements, such as:

[converting] the compressed binary stream into compressed ASCII text encoded from the compressed binary stream, and [formatting] the compressed ASCII text so as to form a compressed valid XML document,

as incorporated into claim 19 from base claim 16.

Additionally as set forth above, these documents do not provide using a transformation to and from ASCII in the framework of XML compression. The Office Action concedes that Cseri, Petersen and Girardot do not disclose a compression module that includes a binary to ASCII encoding algorithm, but states that this is taught in Tycksen. The cited portion of Tycksen refers to a binary-based content to a certificate being converted to the ASCII-code set (*see* Tycksen, col. 9, lines 7-15). Applicant respectfully submits that, upon reading these documents, one of ordinary skill in the art would not reasonably be led to combine Cseri, Petersen and Girardot with Tycksen.

Cseri states that binary formatting is desired because it minimizes parsing time and the generation of overhead incident to formatting and parsing of data. Thus, Cseri teaches away from converting from the binary format to text.

Also, the Office Action states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Tycksen with Cseri in order to convert the XML binary data to ASCII text in order to provide the XML document to a user. However if, as is asserted in the Office Action, one of ordinary skill in the art desired to have an XML document presentable to a user, those skilled would presumably leave the XML file as it was in its original XML form and not convert the file to binary and then to ASCII. Further, Cseri refers to reconverting the binary formatted to an XML format by parsing before forwarding to an appropriate application (*see*, Cseri ¶0067). Thus, a presentable XML document is already disclosed in Cseri, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not reasonably be led to modify Cseri using Tycksen to provide an XML document that is already available in Cseri.

Therefore Cseri, Petersen, Girardot and Tycksen do not provide using a transformation to and from ASCII in the framework of XML compression. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 19 is respectfully requested.

4. Claims 22 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cseri and Petersen as applied to claims 16 above, and further in view of Ma et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0063575; hereinafter “Ma”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 22 depends on base claim 16, and claim 34 depends on base claim 31.

As set forth above, Applicant believes base claims 16 and 31 to be allowable at least for the reason that Cseri with Petersen fails to provide some of the elements of the base claim. Ma fails to provide the missing elements, such as:

[converting] the compressed binary stream into compressed ASCII text encoded from the compressed binary stream, and [formatting] the compressed ASCII text so as to form a compressed valid XML document,

as incorporated into claim 22 from base claim 16 and similarly recited in base claim 31 and incorporated into claim 34. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 22 and 34 is respectfully requested.

5. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cseri and Petersen as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Hsu et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0205158; hereinafter “Hsu”). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 26 ultimately depends on base claim 16. As set forth above, Applicant believes base claim 16 to be allowable at least for the reason that Cseri with Petersen fails to provide some of the elements of the base claim. Hsu fails to provide the missing elements, such as:

[converting] the compressed binary stream into compressed ASCII text encoded from the compressed binary stream, and [formatting] the compressed ASCII text so as to form a compressed valid XML document,

as incorporated into claim 26 from base claim 16. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 26 is respectfully requested.

6. Claims 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cseri and Petersen as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Krasinski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,850,948; hereinafter “Krasinski”).

Claim 36 depends on claim 16, and claims 37 and 38 ultimately depend on claim 31. As set forth above, Applicant believes base claim 16 to be allowable at least for the reason that Cseri with Petersen fails to provide some of the elements of the base claim. Krasinski fails to provide the missing elements, such as:

[converting] the compressed binary stream into compressed ASCII text encoded from the compressed binary stream, and [formatting] the compressed ASCII text so as to form a compressed valid XML document,

as incorporated into claims 36 and 37-38 from claims 16 and 31, respectively.

Additionally, claim 38 recites, among other things, the *decompression module is configured to receive the compressed valid XML document containing compressed text*. The Office Action asserts that this is found in Cseri. However, the cited portions of Cseri state that a binary formatted XML document [is received] at the receiving device before passing the document to a standard parser (see Cseri, ¶0063). Thus, Cseri receives a binary formatted document and not the compressed valid XML document of claim 31.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 36-38 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at (612) 371-2172 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or deficiencies, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402--0938
(612) 371-2172

Date December 14, 2009

By 1 Paul J. Urbanski 1
Paul J. Urbanski
Reg. No. 58,351

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 14th day of December, 2009.

CHERYL L. KNAPP

Name

1 Cheryl L Knapp 1
Signature